

PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT OR AN ASSAULT ON HUMANITY?

Michael S. Coffman, Ph.D.

"Every law and institution, every treaty and alliance, every tactic and strategy, every plan and course of action — to use, in short, every means to halt the destruction of the environment and to preserve and nurture our ecological system.... [M]oderate improvements in laws and regulations, rhetoric offered in lieu of genuine change — these are all forms of appeasement, designed to satisfy the public's desire to believe that sacrifice, struggle, and a *wrenching transformation of society* will not be necessary." (Italics added)

Although these words are penned by no other than Vice President Al Gore in *Earth in the Balance*, they also represent the goals of national and international environmental leaders.

Yet very few Americans, even environmentalists, know that this "wrenching transformation" means a total and painful retrogression from a free society having one of the highest standards of living known to mankind, to a tightly regulated society with a vastly reduced standard of living.

Indeed, such a transformation was at the heart of the Convention on Biological Diversity treaty that was officially created during the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1992.

While this twenty page treaty looked innocent enough, in reality it was nothing more than an outline of lofty principles and goals.

The teeth, according to Article 25 of the treaty, was to be provided by the United Nations Global Biodiversity Assessment (GBA). This twelve section, multi-thousand page GBA is truly stunning in its outline to transform the world.

In the GBA vision of reality, "Societies dominated by Islam, and especially Christianity have gone farthest in *setting humans apart from nature*.... In the process... *nature* [has] *lost its sacred qualities*." (Section 8.3.5) "Nature has an integral set of different values (cultural, spiritual, and material)", the GBA continues, to which humanity must conform. Human beings are merely "one strand in nature's web" and are no more important than any other living creature. Therefore, "the natural way is right, and *human activities should be molded along nature's rhythms*." (§9.2.3.1.2) (Italics added)

Cast in this worldview, concludes the treaty's GBA, human "population growth has exceeded the capacity of the biosphere...to sustain it." To maintain our current global population of 5 to 7 billion people we must reduce our standard of living to that of "an 'agricultural world' in which *most human*

beings are peasants." (Italics added)

If becoming an agrarian peasant is not to your liking the GBA provides an alternative, "A reasonable, [population] estimate for an industrialized world society at the present North American material standard of living would be *1 billion*" *people!* (§9.2.3.2) (Italics added)

The treaty's GBA frames biodiversity as a "public good" to be part of a "global commons" to be administered by "The Global Environmental Facility." Since any human activity can threaten biodiversity, *all* human activity must be tightly regulated. "Green fees and taxes" against such damaging activities as agriculture, forestry, mining, golfing are recommended. Heavy "consumption taxes" are to replace income taxes to discourage the use of automobiles, air-conditioners and other items deemed not essential to basic human needs. (§10.3, 9.2.2.6, & 10.5.2.2&3)

The plan calls for organizing our society into self-sustaining "bioregions" which "will be administered under a mixture of central or local government, private, community and community tenurial rights." (§10.1.5 & 10.7.3.4) Non Governmental Organizations such as the Sierra Club, Wilderness Society, and other environmental groups would be given "legal standing" to participate in all levels of governance and to police the treaty. (§10.6.all)

The heart of the treaty's GBA is to protect biodiversity by creating vast wilderness areas and national parks. Based entirely on pseudo-scientific theory, the plan calls for "representative areas of all major ecosystems in a region...to be reserved.... [Reserved] blocks should be as large as possible (up to 25 million acres each)...., buffer zones should be established around core areas, and corridors should connect these areas. This basic design is central to the recently-proposed 'Wildlands Project' in the United States." (§ 10.4.2.2.3)

The Wildlands Project to which the GBA cites recommends "that *at least half of the land area of the 48 conterminous states*...be encompassed in core reserves and inner corridor zones...within the next few decades." "Eventually," continues the article, a *wilderness network would dominate a region and thus would itself constitute the matrix, with human habitations being the islands*." (Italics added)

It was this evidence, along with maps provided by the Maine Conservation Rights Institute that depict what this "wilderness matrix" might look like, that stopped the ratifi-

cation process in the U.S. Senate last September — hours before the cloture vote was to be taken.

If these outrageous documents represented a isolated "wish list" of extreme environmentalists, it could be discounted. As a treaty that was almost ratified by the U.S. Senate, we should all be concerned.

The treaty is not the only avenue by which this agenda is being implemented. The stated goal of the United States Man and the Biosphere Program, housed in the U.S. State Department, is to be the testing ground for these concepts. This plan calls for utilizing "protected areas - such as wilderness areas or nature reserves" in exactly the way described by the GBA and Wildlands Project.

Likewise, the April 28, 1995 issue of *Inside EPA* notes the Presidents Council on Sustainable Development (PCSD) calls for the creation of "a network of conservation areas for each bio-region in the country...."

The PCSD appears to include almost every major point covered in the GBA. The *Inside EPA* article concludes that "many of the...recommendations are to radical to ever be implemented...." One member of the council was quoted as saying "If I am a conservative Republican on Capitol Hill, this is red meat for me to say, 'The Clinton administration is trying to practice social engineering.'"

All of this brings to mind the accelerating efforts in recent years by environmental leadership and key federal agencies to push programs like the National Biological Survey, ecosystem management, "greater ecosystem" planning, multi-county and state comprehensive planning, new national parks and "special area" set-asides. Can America survive this assault on humanity? A growing number of people are beginning to think not.

Some of the most radical changes in the history of America are being planned by governmental and environmental leadership. Throughout all the documents, the claim is made that this is to be a public and collaborative effort involving "local citizens." Yet we citizens have heard nary a word. Why?

Dr. Coffman is President of Environmental Perspectives, Inc., an environmental consulting company in Bangor, Maine, and Board member of the Maine Conservation Rights Institute. He has 25 years of experience in teaching and research in ecology and ecosystem management and has written several books on ecosystem classification and the environmental movement, including *Saviors of the Earth? The Politics and Religion of the Environmental Movement*. Dr. Coffman lead the U.S. Senate effort to defeat the Biodiversity Treaty.